



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXV, 3.

WHOLE No. 99.

I.—THE OXYRHYNCHUS EPITOME OF LIVY IN RELATION TO OBSEQUENS AND CASSIODORUS.

I.

Some months since the welcome announcement was made by Grenfell and Hunt that their campaign of 1903 at Oxyrhynchus had discovered a portion of an epitome of Livy hitherto unknown. The fourth volume of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* brings us this fragmentary epitome edited with that acute scholarship which the discoverers everywhere display; they have had also the assistance of Mr. W. Warde Fowler and of Professors Korne-
mann, Reid, and Wissowa. While little has escaped the attention of this group of scholars, there yet remain for discussion some interesting questions, and in one important point at least the relations of the *Oxyrhynchus* epitome have not yet been observed.

The portions recovered are drawn from books 37-40 and 48-55, treating events from the end of 190 to 179 B. C. and from 150 to 137 B. C. The latter period is one in which our authorities are so scanty that every fragment of new information is welcome, and the amount of new information gained, especially on points of chronology, is not small, as Grenfell and Hunt point out, p. 94.

The writing is described by the editors as 'a medium-sized upright uncial with some admixture of minuscule forms', and is dated by them as certainly not later than the beginning of the fourth century and more probably belonging to the third. The papyrus is so sadly mutilated that hardly a line remains complete, but the supplements are in part readily made. Furthermore the scribe seems to have been guilty of great carelessness and stupidity in spelling and grammar so that in some cases it is impossible to determine what stood in the original, even when the lines are unbroken. The form of this new epitome is that

of a chronicle in which each year is indicated by the names in the ablative case, followed by a bald enumeration of events in strict chronological order. In fact, the best description of the *Oxyrhynchus periochae* was unwittingly given by Mommsen in 1861, while discussing the sources of Cassiodorus's chronicle¹: 'es ist ganz im Geiste der Kaiserzeit, dass man das weitläufige und viel "Ueberflüssiges" enthaltende Werk des Livius früh in einen kurz das Thatsächliche Jahr für Jahr, unter Voraustellung der Consulnamen im Ablativ, zusammenfassenden Abriss gebracht hat.' Mommsen (l. c.) also first established the fact that a considerable number of authors, not only Cassiodorus but also Vopiscus, Obsequens, Eutropius, Festus, and Idatius, drew not from Livy direct but from a lost epitome which departed at some points from its original. Zangemeister² proved that the *Periochae* and *Orosius* belonged to the number. Still other writers were added by Pirogoff, Droysen, Wagener, Haupt, Maurenbrecher, and Ay, and the date at which an epitome of Livy was made was carried back until Sanders³ showed that Livy was certainly abridged before the end of Tiberius's reign.

The discovery therefore of an epitome corresponding in outward form so closely to the epitome postulated by Mommsen in the passage quoted, raises at once a series of interesting questions as to its relation to Livy, to the *Periochae* long known, and to the later writers who drew indirectly from Livy's complete work. Fortunately for us the first three columns of the papyrus cover the years 190-179, a period which is treated in Livy's extant books 37-40, so that we can here determine the relation of the *Oxyrhynchus periochae* to their ultimate source. The bald account of O naturally gives only facts and results and admits of no discussions or long exposition of motives. Yet all the most important events are noted. While at times phrases and clauses are repeated from Livy, there is on the whole no striking verbal agreement. O occasionally paraphrases Livy's account, as e. g. ll. 3-6 P. Licinius⁴ [pontif]ex maximus Q. Fabium pr(aetorem) quod flamen Quirinalis⁵ erat proficisci in

¹ Die Chronik des Cassiodorus Senator, p. 552, in *Abh. der sächs. Gesell. der Wiss.*, Leipzig, 1861.

² Die *Periochae* des Livius in *Festschrift für die Karlsruher Philologenversammlung*, Freiburg i. B. 1882.

³ Die Quellencontamination im 21 und 22 Buche des Livius, 1, 1897.

⁴ Pap. Lepidinus maximus.

⁵ Pap. Quirinalium.

Sardiniam [. . .]ant, which reproduces Livy 37, 51, 1-3 priusquam in provincias praetores irent, certamen inter P. Licinium pontificem maximum fuit et Q. Fabium Pictorem flaminem Quirinalem, quale patrum memoria inter L. Metellum et Postumium Albinum fuerat. consulem illum cum C. Lutatio collega in Siciliam ad classem proficiscentem ad sacra retinuerat Metellus, pontifex maximus; praetorem hunc ne in Sardiniam proficisceretur, P. Licinius tenuit. Again we find mere condensation with no verbal similarity, as when l. 18 [inter Achae]os et Lacedaemonios cruenta proelia covers, although inexactly, Livy 38, 30-34. An extreme case is in l. 12, where [Ambra]cia capta summarizes Livy 38, 1-9. The most striking instance in which Livy's words have been preserved is ll. 78-80 L. Livius trib(unus) pl(ebis) quod [annos nati quemque] magistratum pete[rent rogatio lata] est,¹ cf. Livy 40, 44, 1 eo anno rogatio primum lata est ab L. Villio tribuno plebis, quot annos nati quemque magistratum peterent caperentque. Usually, however, when there is little or no condensation, O employs a different phrase from Livy, e. g. ll. 42 f. at[hletarum cer]tamina primum a Fu[lvio Nobilior]e edita, which represents Livy 39, 22, 2 athletarum . . . certamen tum primo Romanis spectaculo fuit.

When we compare O with the Periochae, we see at a glance, as Rossbach (Berl. Phil. Wochenschrift, No. 31/2, 1904, col. 1020 ff.) has pointed out, that neither can be the source of the other. Not only does O chronicle more and different events than the Periochae—in the epitome of book 39, for example, O mentions at least fifteen events, eight of which are not given in the corresponding Periocha—but a comparison of the language in which the same events are reported shows that whatever their common source, that source was clearly remote. Their verbal differences may be illustrated by the story of Orgiagon's wife:

O ll. 14-17²

Origiacontis captian nobilis
[centuri]onem cuius vim pass(a)
erat aurum admit[t . . .] pos-
centem occidit caputque eius
ad virum [secum? tulit].

PER. 39.

exemplum quoque virtutis et
pudicitiae in femina traditur.
quae cum regis Gallograecorum
fuisset, capta centurionem qui
ei vim intulerat occidit.

¹ This of course must be emended with Grenfell and Hunt to read a L. Villio trib(un)o pl(ebis) quot, etc.

² The text of O is given as printed by Grenfell and Hunt unless otherwise noted.

Yet a comparison of the two stories as given above with Livy's words makes it probable that the common source of O and the Periochae was not the unabridged Livy, for his account runs thus (38, 24, 2-10): Orgiagontis reguli uxor forma eximia cui custodiae centurio praeerat corpori . . . vim fecit. ubi cum aurum ostenderent . . . mulier lingua sua stringerent ferrum et centurionem pensantem aurum occiderent, imperavit. Iugulati praecisum caput ipsa involutum veste ferens ad virum Orgiagontem pervenit; etc.

A further illustration of the divergences between O and the Periochae may be found in the account of the defeat of Q. Fabius by Viriathus:

O ll. 185 f.

[Q.] Fabius Maximus a Viriath{o}o devictus de[f]ormem cum hostibus pacem fecit.

PER. 54.

Q. Fabius procos. rebus in Hispania prospere gestis labem imposuit pace cum Viriato aequis condicionibus facta.

There is a further striking divergence in point of style. Woelfflin, in the *Commentationes in honorem Theodori Mommseni* (1877), p. 338, pointed out that while the Periochae show a periodic style in which *qui, cum, ne*, etc. are frequently employed, the style of the complete periocha of the first book, Ia in Jahn's edition, is abrupt, chronicling events in three ways: it uses the substantive without a verb—*adventus Aeneae, Tulliae scelus in patrem, Superbi expulsio*; the perfect passive participle without the copula—*Amulius obtruncatus, Tullus fulmine consumptus*; and the perfect indicative active—*Tullus Hostilius Albanos diripuit, Servio Tullio caput arsit*. Rossbach (l. c., col. 1022) recognizes that O shows the same characteristic forms, e. g. l. 1 [in Hispa]nia Romani caesi, l. 11 [Ambra]cia capta, l. 212 Lusitani vastati; l. 27 [Gracchus t]rib(unus) pl(ebis) intercessit, ll. 46 f. Scipio . . . con[lat]a pecunia feci[t]; l. 18 [inter Achae]os et Lacedaemonios cruenta [pr]oelia. He therefore regards the authorship of O as identical with that of Periocha Ia, probably correctly. In any case no one can deny that the stylistic resemblance is very close.

The next question that arises is whether any intimate relation is to be found between O and the later writers who drew from an abridged Livy. That such relations undoubtedly exist, I shall immediately show; they seem, however, to have escaped the notice of Grenfell and Hunt as well as their coadjutors. First, let

us compare the list of consuls in O with that given by Cassiodorus for the corresponding years. We find at once a striking similarity between them. While in both lists the officials are generally designated by two names only, *praenomen* with the *nomen* or *cognomen*, after the fashion of the republic, in seven cases out of twenty O gives the full three names; but in four of these seven instances Cassiodorus likewise employs the complete names, so that no significance is to be attached to the other three.¹ But a proof of the close relationship between the two, so far as the consular list is concerned, is furnished by the names of the consuls for 149 B. C.: O l. 88, L. Marcio Censorino M. *Manlio* cos.; cf. l. 103 *Manlio*² et Marc<i> o c[os.]; Cassiodorus, L. Marcius et M. *Manlius*; the correct form is preserved by the Periocha, L. Marcio M'. *Manilio*; cf. Censorinus, *de die nat.* 17, 11 L. Marcio Censorino M'. *Manilio*.³ This agreement in the error *Manlio* points to a close connection between O and Cassiodorus. While such consensus is not in itself full proof, the matter is raised to a high degree of certainty by the notice of the introduction of athletic exhibitions in the year 186 B. C.:—

O ll. 42 f.

CASSIODORUS.

At[hletarum cer]tamina pri- His cons̄s. athletarum cer-
mum a Ful[vio Nobilior]e edita. tamina primum a Fulvio edita.

The contrast between these notices and Livy's phrase (39, 22, 2) *athletarum certamen tum primo Romanis spectaculo fuit*⁴ shows that not only is there an intimate relation between O and Cassiodorus, but that both drew from a common source other than a complete Livy. A suggestion that Cassiodorus drew from O is rendered improbable by the difference in the names of the consuls for the year 179, and by other reasons (cf. *infra*, pp. 246 ff.). We may fairly say at once that this common source was a chronicle similar in form to that partly recovered in O but

¹ A single discrepancy between the two lists is found in the names of the consuls for 179 B. C. where O has Q. Fulvio M. Manlio, Cassiodorus correctly Q. Fulvius et L. Manlius. Obsequens 7 Q. Fulvio C. Manlio.

² That this is hardly a mere scribe's blunder for *Man<i>lio* is shown by the repetition. The error existed rather in the archetype of O (and of Cassiodorus). Grenfell and Hunt should not have changed to *Man<i>lio* as they have done, following the Periocha.

³ The correct form is also given by Florus 1, 31, 7; Oros. 4, 22, 1; App. P. 75, 97; Zonares 9, 26; and in Eutrop. 4, 10, where P D have *Marco Mallio*, but the metaphor of Paconius shows that *Manilio* belongs in the Latin text.

⁴ The notice is not elsewhere preserved, so far as I know.

somewhat fuller in matter. By this last hypothesis we can perhaps explain such confusions, due to condensation, as in O, l. 7, *Rhodonía de soli deducta*, where apparently a notice of the founding of Bononia (Livy 37, 57, 7) has been confused with a preceding reference to the Rhodians, either to their embassy about Soli (Livy 37, 56, 7-10), as Reid thinks (Class. Review, July, 1904, p. 261), or to the additions made to their territory in recognition of the aid given by them to the Romans (Livy 37, 56, 5 f.).¹ We can thus understand the chronological confusion in ll. 17, 44 f.² and elsewhere.

Whether O and Cassiodorus drew immediately from this parent chronicle or not is a question at present beyond answer. But it is clear that in all discussions of the 'lost epitome' of Livy we must postulate a number of epitomes, all going back perhaps to the epitome used by Valerius Maximus, but furnishing various lines of descent for the later histories and chronicles. All that has thus far been determined is the not uninteresting fact that the chronicle of Cassiodorus—for the republic—and the Oxyrhynchus periochae have the same parent source to which they stand relatively near.

Mommsen long since pointed out³ that Julius Obsequens and Cassiodorus drew from a common source. That this was an epitome of Livy's history, varying from it in phraseology, is evident from the following: Under the year 571/183 Cassiodorus has the notice—His consulibus Hannibal apud Prusian veneno periiit; Obsequens 4, Hannibal in Bithynia veneno periiit. From these we can perhaps reconstruct the notice in the source from which they drew, Hannibal apud Prusian in Bithynia veneno periiit. But Livy's words are (39, 51, 7-12) Hannibal . . . venenum . . . poposcit . . . poculum exhausit.⁴ Again compare Cassiodorus 648/106, His consulibus per Servilium Cae-

¹ Cf. Per. 37 Rhodiis quoque, qui et ipsi iuverant, quaedam civitates concessae, colonia deducta est Bononia.

² Cf. Grenfell and Hunt's notes.

³ Die Chronik des Cassiodorus Senator, p. 552.

⁴ It is also clear that the immediate source of Obsequens and Cassiodorus was not that from which others drew. Cf. Per. 39 Hannibal . . . *veneno sibi mortem conscivit*; Ampel. 34, 2 *veneno se liberavit*; Eutrop. 4, 5 Hannibal . . . *venenum bibit* et apud Libyssam . . . sepultus est, followed by Hieronymus in his chronicle, Hannibal . . . *venenum bibit* et apud Libyssam . . . sepultus est. De viris ill. 42, 6 Hannibal *veneno absumptus est*. Oros. 4, 20, 29 Hannibal . . . *veneno se necavit*. Still more widely divergent is Appian Sy. 11 τὸν Ἀννίβαν . . . ἔκτεινε (Φλαυνίως) διὰ τοῦ Προυσίου φαρμάκου.

pionem consulem iudicia equitibus et senatoribus communicata, with Obs. 41, Per Caepionem consulem senatorum et equitum iudicia communicata; and still further Cassiodorus 658/96 and 671/83 with Obsequens 49 and 57. It is therefore important to compare Obsequens with the Oxyrhynchus Epitome. Unfortunately only six notices are common to them, and in the case of three out of the six the text of O is badly mutilated. O ll. 64 f. Han[nibal] fl [. . . .] uhe [. . . . , apparently contained a notice of Hannibal's death, but no comparison is possible with Obs. 4. The case is hardly better with O ll. 132-4 which have reference to the operations before Carthage in the year 147 B. C. for the text is hopelessly corrupt. Furthermore the notice in Obs. 20 cum Carthago obsideretur in captivos Romanorum per Hasdrubalem barbaro more saevitum, mox Carthago per Aemilianum diruta is apparently a careless condensation, for the fall of Carthage is placed a year too soon. There is a similar chronological error, likewise perhaps due to condensation, in Obs. 23 annus pacatus est Viriatho victo; O ll. 197 f. gives the names of the assassins, Audax Minurus <D>ita[lco] Viriathum iugula[verunt. Neither agrees in phraseology with our other authorities: Vell. Paterc. 2, 1, 3 interempto Viriatho, Val. Max. 9, 6, 4 interemptus est; Per. 54, Eutrop. 4, 6, 12, and Oros. 5, 4, 14 interfectus est; De Viris Ill. 71, 3 satellites qui Viriathum peremerunt. Compare further Obs. 19 Pseudophilippus devictus and O l. 127 [Philippus a] Metello captus est;¹ Obs. 3 Galli qui Alpes transierunt in Italiam sine proelio eiecti and O ll. 44 f. Galli(s) in Ital[iam transgressis Ma]rcellum [p]ersuasit [ut trans Alpes redire]nt.² But if these notices exhibit no striking parallelism between O and Obsequens, it is clear that the entries in Obs. 19 and O ll. 127-9 show adherence to a common source:

O.

sacrarium [regiae et laur]us foci
maximo incendio [inviolata]³

OBSEQUENS.

vasto incendio . . . sacrarium et
ex duabus altera laurus ex mediis
ignibus inviolata exstiterunt.

¹ Cf. Per. 50 Pseudophilippus in Macedonia . . . ab Quinto Caecilio victus captusque est.

² The text is printed thus by Grenfell and Hunt. The suggestion by Reid Cl. Rev. July, 1904, p. 292, is better: Ma]rcellus [p]ersuasit [ut Italia excedere]nt.

³ The text is given as restored by Roszbach, Berl. Phil. Wochenschrift, No. 31/2, 1904, col. 1021. The papyrus has]us soci, etc. So far as I know, the marvel is not chronicled elsewhere.

The scanty and mutilated condition of our material, however, forces us to look further for supporting proofs of the use of the same source by Obsequens and O. First of all we find a parallelism in the chronicles of certain successes, e. g., Obs. 4 Celteberi *subacti*, 48 Celteberi Medi Dardani *subacti*; O l. 42 His]pan[i] *subacti*, 136 Lu]sitani *subacti* (pap. subalti). Obs. 11 rex Illyrici Gentius et Macedoniae Perses *devicti*, 19 Pseudophilippus *devictus*, and 24, 32, 47, 62; O l. 164 a Tyresio quem *devicit*, 185 [Q.] Fabius Maximus a Viriatho *devictus*. Cf. also Periocha Ia Latinos . . . *devicit*; while the Periochae regularly use the simple *vincere* (see Woelfflin, Commentationes Mommsenianae, p. 338). Furthermore, as has been observed above, there is little of the periodic style in O, such as we find in the Periochae, but instead we have brief notices given by noun without verb, perfect passive participle without copula, and by the perfect indicative. This is exactly the style of Obsequens, e. g., § 4 M. Claudio Q. Fabio Labeone coss. in area Vulcani per biduum, in ara Concordiae totidem diebus sanguinem *pluit*. in Sicilia *insula nova maritima*. Hannibal in Bithynia veneno *periit*. Celtiberi *subacti*, § 5 L. Aemilio Paulo Cn. Baebio Tamphilo coss. procellosa tempestas strage in urbe facta signa aenea in Capitolio *deiecit*, signa in circo maximo cum columnis *evertit*, fastigia templorum a culmine abrupta *dissipavit*. mulus tripes Reate *natus*. aedes Apollinis Caietae fulmine *icta*. Compare with this the opening lines of O: [in Hispa]nia Romani *caesi*. [M. Fulvio] Cn. Manlio cos. [.] § pax iterum *data est*. P. Lepidinus { maximus } [pontif]ex maximus Q. Fabium pr(aetorem) quod flamen [Quirin]alem erat proficisci in Sardiniam [.] *ant*. Ant[i]ocho regi pax *data*. Lusitani [*vastati*]. Rhodonia desoli *deducta*. [Glabrio c]ensuram petens minantes [accusa]tionem compellitoribus composito [*destiti*]*t*. The historical notices in Cassiodorus, with rare exceptions, have the same form, e. g.—515 His consulibus ludis Romanis primum tragoedia et comoedia a Lucio Livio ad scaenam *data*; 524 His consulibus Hamilcar Hannibalis pater in Hispania bellum Romanis parans *occisus est*. Hic *solitus* dicere quattuor filios contra p. R. velut catulos leoninos <se> educare; and so passim. In view of this and of the relation long recognized between Obsequens and Cassiodorus we are justified, notwithstanding the scanty and fragmentary material at hand for a comparison between Obsequens and O, in concluding that O, Obsequens, and Cassiodorus all come

from a common source to which they are more closely related than are other later historians,¹ as has been already indicated on p. 246 n. 4. This point will be more fully illustrated below. Furthermore, from a comparison of the three, it is evident that this source was a chronicle in which each year was designated by the names of the consuls in the ablative case;² then followed in chronological order the principal events and portents of the year, noted in the abrupt style displayed by its descendants. That the parent chronicle contained a record of portents is shown not only by Julius Obsequens, but also by the fact that O, while almost wholly given to secular matters, still records (ll. 127-9) the miraculous preservation of the *sacrarium* and the sacred laurel, and again (ll. 59-63) reports the fulfilment of a prophecy: P. Licini Crassi po[ntificis maximi] ludis funeribus [. in foro tabernaculis po[sitis evenit id quod] nate[s c]ecin[e]rat [tabernacula] in foro futura.

This fragmentary epitome, therefore, has brought us one step farther on in the problem of disentangling the complex inter-relations of the followers of Livy. It would now be desirable to examine again the other historians and chroniclers from Valerius Maximus down in the hope of carrying on to more certain results the work of those scholars who have followed after Mommsen and Zangemeister. That is, however, too large a task to be entered on here.

II.

As has been said above, O, Obsequens, and Cassiodorus apparently drew from a chronicle not identical with the epitome (or epitomes) used by most other writers; a brief portion of the evidence for this statement has been given on p. 246 n. 4. For further illustration the two following anecdotes are well suited,

¹ With the possible exception of Eutropius. Vid. *infra*, p. 255.

² As Mommsen divined, *Die Chronik des Cassiodorus Senator*, p. 552. If the editors had apprehended the relation between O and Cassiodorus, they would have supplied the missing names of the consuls differently in some cases. E. g. 188 instead of [*M. Valerio L*]ivio Salinatore cos. read with Cassiodorus [*M. Messala C.*] Livio Salinatore cos.; 187 instead of [*M. Aemilio C. Fl*]aminio cos. read [*M. Lepido C. Fl*]aminio cos.; 148 instead of [*Sp. Albino L. Piso*]ne cos. read [*Sp. Postumio L. Piso*]ne cos.; 147 instead of [*P. Cornelio C. Livio*] cos. read [*P. Africano C. Livio*] cos. (cf. also Obsequens); 144 instead of Ser. Galba L. [*Cotta* cos. read Ser. Galba L. [*Aurelio* cos. 181 P. Lentulo should not be corrected to *Cornelio* (or *Cethego*).

being given at comparative length by O and being preserved in both Livy and a number of later authors. These are the vengeance taken by Orgiagon's wife, already given, p. 243, and the cause of the expulsion of L. Quintus Flaminius from the senate. The first story, as told by O ll. 14-17, is repeated here for convenience:

Orgiagontis captian nobilis [centuri]onem cuius vim pass(a) erat aurum admit[t] poscentem occidit caputque eius ad virum [secum? tulit].¹

This can best be compared first with its ultimate source, Livy, 38, 24, 2-10, and with Valerius Maximus, 6, 1, ext. 2.

LIVY.

Orgiagontis reguli uxor forma eximia custodiebatur inter plures captivos, cui custodiae centurio praeerat . . . is . . . corpori . . . vim fecit. certo auri pondere pactus locum prope flumen constituit nocte insequenti et duo necessarii mulieris ad constitutum locum et centurio cum captiva venit. ubi cum aurum ostenderent , mulier lingua sua stringerent ferrum et centurionem pensantem aurum occiderent, imperavit. iugulati praecisum caput ipsa involutum veste ferens ad virum Orgiagontem pervenit; . . . caput centurionis ante pedes eius abiecit et iniuriam corporis et ultionem violatae per vim pudicitiae confessa viro est.

VALERIUS MAXIMUS.

Orgiagontis reguli uxor mirae pulchritudinis a centurione, cui custodienda tradita erat stuprum pati coacta

postquam ventum est in eum locum in quem centurio misso nuntio necessarios mulieris pretium, quo eam redimerent, adferre iusserat, aurum expendente centurione et in eius pondus animo oculisque intento Gallograecis lingua gentis suae imperavit ut eum occiderent. interfecti deinde caput abscisum manibus retinens ad coniugem venit, abiectoque ante pedes eius iniuriae et ultionis suae ordinem exposuit.

It is evident at a glance that the amount of verbal agreement between the Livy and Valerius Maximus's derivative account is great: there are trifling divergences in phrase and construction, but they are of little significance; still less the use of the classic

¹ Printed thus by Grenfell and Hunt.

expendo for Livy's *penso* and *abscido* for *praecido*. The words *et in eius pondus animo oculisque intento* are only a rhetorical touch for Livy's *cum aurum ostenderent*, etc. We must remember that Valerius Maximus was no copyist like Cassiodorus or Jordanes. So far as this single anecdote goes, it would be unnecessary to suppose that he drew from any source but Livy's original account.¹

When we turn to O, whose author was on a very different literary plane from Valerius Maximus, and compare it with the two older accounts, we find a certain divergence in form of expression. For Livy's *corpori vim fecit* and Valerius Maximus's *stuprum pati coacta* O has the eclectic phrase, so to speak, *cuius vim passa erat*; and passing by the following words, which are perhaps hopelessly corrupt,² the simple *occidit* outdoes Livy and Valerius Maximus in making the outraged woman avenge her wrong with her own hands. In this point O and the Periocha agree.

Per. 38 *exemplum quoque virtutis et pudicitiae in femina traditur. quae cum regis Gallograecorum uxor fuisset, capta centurionem qui ei vim intulerat occidit.*

Although this agrees with O in the point just noted, it differs from it—as from Valerius Maximus and Livy—by shifting the emphasis through *cum regis Gallograecorum uxor fuisset* in place of the direct statement, as well as by a slightly varying phraseology, *qui ei vim intulerat* instead of *cuius vim passa erat*. Especially to be noted is the fact that the Periocha makes no mention of the ransom or of the ghastly proof of her revenge which the princess carried to her husband.

The account given by Florus, and by Jordanes who follows Florus exactly, is as follows: Florus 1, 27, 6. *Orgiacontis regis uxor a centurione stuprum passa memorabili exemplo custodiam evasit revolsumque adulteri hostis caput ad maritum reportavit.*

Here, too, no mention is made of the ransom, but on the contrary we are told that the queen escaped and carried her violator's head with her; and it is worth while to note that Florus has substituted the more vivid *revellere* for *abscido* and *praecido* of the earlier accounts.

¹ Of course this is not to call into question Sanders' conclusions (Die Quellencontamination, pp. 45 ff.) that Valerius Maximus used an epitome of Livy.

² Unless indeed we adopt Rossbach's plausible emendation (Berl. Phil. Woch. No. 31-2, 1904, col. 1020), *aurum ad (se) mit[tendum] poscentem*. If this be right, we have marked departure from Livy in the facts.

Finally we have the story told by the unknown author of the *De Viris Illustribus* 55, 2: inter captivos uxor regis Ortiagontis centurioni cuidam in custodiam data; a quo vi stuprata de iniuria tacuit; et post impetrata redemptione marito adulterum interficiendum tradidit.

This writer has departed yet more widely from his predecessors in recording the woman's cleverness, *de iniuria tacuit*, and in transferring the punishment of the centurion from his victim to her husband.

Now the comparison between these five accounts shows unquestionably that all were based ultimately on Livy, who in his turn drew from Polybius (ap. Plut. *mul. virt.* p. 258 E-F). Yet after all allowance has been made for the individualities of the several authors as shown in choice of material and expression, it is clear that all do not stand equally close to their source: the first place belongs to Valerius Maximus; next we have O and the Periocha, independent of each other and not drawn from the same immediate source as is proved by content and style;¹ and finally Florus and the *De Viris Illustribus* are most remote. But what is chiefly significant for us at the present moment is that, so far as we may judge from this single anecdote, the differences between O and the Periocha, Florus, and *De Viris Illustribus* make it improbable that the direct source of O was that from which the others drew.²

This view is supported by a comparison of the several accounts of the expulsion of L. Quintius Flamininus from the senate. The mutilated text of O is as follows:

O ll. 52-57. L. Quintius Fla[mininus] Gallia quod Philippo [Poeni scorto] suo desiderante gladia[torium specta]-culum sua manu Boiu[m³ nobilem occiderat] a M. Catone⁴ cen-[sore senatu motus est].

It will be convenient to give the other accounts at once:

Livy 39, 42, 5-43, 3. Censores M. Porcius et L. Valerius septem moverunt senatu, ex quibus unum insignem et nobilitate

¹ Cf. supra pp. 243 ff.

² Valerius Maximus is naturally excluded from consideration here by his date. It may be said in passing that it is also by no means certain that the Periocha, Florus, and *De Viris Illustribus* drew from the same direct source. There are many differences between them similar to those noted above which seem to point to divergent lines of tradition. Cf. Sanders, *Die Quellencontamination*.

³ Pap. Bonu[m].

⁴ Pap. lanatone.

et honoribus, L. Quinctium Flaminium consularem obicit (sc. Cato) ei Philippum Poenum, carum et nobile scortum, ab Roma in Galliam provinciam speingentium donorum perductum. eum puerum, per lasciviam cum cavillaretur, exprobrare consuli persaepe solitum, quod sub ipsum spectaculum gladiatorum abductus ab Roma esset, ut obsequium amatori vendicaret. forte epulantibus iis, cum iam vino incaluissent, nuntiatum in convivio esse, nobilem Boium cum liberis transfugam venisse: convenire consulem velle, ut ab eo fidem praesens acciperet. introductum adloqui consulem coepisse. inter cuius sermonem Quinctius scorto "vis tu," inquit, "quoniam gladiatorum spectaculum reliquisti, iam hunc Gallum morientem videre?" et cum is vixdum serio adnuisset, ad nutum scorti consulem stricto gladio loquenti Gallo caput primum percussisse, deinde fugienti latus transfodisse. Valerius Antias . . . aliud argumentum . . . peragit. Placentiae famosam mulierem, cuius amore deperiret, in convivium accersitam scribit; ibi iactantem sese scorto inter cetera rettulisse, ... quam multos capitis damnatos in vinculis haberet, quos securi percussurus esset. tum illam infra eum adcubantem negasse umquam vidisse quemquam securi ferientem et pervelle id videre. hic indulgentem amatorem unum ex illis miseris adtrahi iussum securi percussisse.

Per. 39 a censoribus L. Valerio Flacco et M. Porcio Catone motus est senatu L. Quintius Flamininus, T. frater, eo quod cum Galliam provinciam consul obtineret, rogatus a Poeno Philippo quem amabat, scorto nobili, Gallum quendam sua manu occiderat sive, ut quidam tradiderunt, unum ex damnatis securi percusserat rogatus a meretrice Placentina, cuius amore deperibat.

Sen. Cont. 9, 2 praef. Flamininus proconsul inter cenam a meretrice rogatus, quae aiebat se numquam vidisse hominem decollari, unum ex damnatis occidit.

Hier. in Matt. 2, 14 Legimus in Romana historia Flaminium ducem Romanum quod accubanti iuxta meretriculae latus quae nunquam se vidisse diceret hominem decollatum, assensus sit ut reus quidam capitalis criminis in convivio truncaretur, a censoribus pulsum curia.

Val. Max. 2, 9, 3 Sicut Porcius Cato L. Flaminium, quem e numero senatorum sustulit, quia in provincia quendam damnatum securi percusserat tempore supplicii ad arbitrium et spectaculum mulierculae, cuius amore tenebatur, electo.

De Viris Ill. 47, 4 Censor (sc. Cato) L. Flaminium consularem senatu movit, quod ille in Gallia ad cuiusdam scorti spectaculum eductum quendam e carcere in convivio iugulari iussisset.

Plutarch, Cato 17 and Titus 18, follows Livy on the whole but shows the influence of Cicero, C. M. 42. He says in both passages—too long to quote here—that at a dinner Flamininus had one of those already condemned killed to please Philip, referring to Cicero as his authority; but he notes that Livy also says that the victim was a refugee and that Flamininus killed him with his own hand. In Titus 18 Valerius Antias is also quoted (from Livy) as saying that this was done to please a meretrix, not Philip. Plutarch therefore need not be considered further here. As for the other accounts it will be readily seen that the Periocha here reproduces Livy most completely; that Seneca and St. Jerome are closely related, using the unusual *decollare* for Livy's *securi percutere*; and that Valerius Maximus and the De Viris Ill. show no striking affinity with any other author.

Omitting however all minor points, we must note primarily that O gives the first half of the story only, while Valerius Maximus, Seneca, De Viris Ill., and St. Jerome confine themselves to the second half. It may properly be urged that such difference in choice does not in itself show difference in direct source, that the original of the five accounts may have contained both versions, may indeed have been the original of the Periocha, and that O took one half while the rest chose the other. This would be entirely possible, if the question depended on this anecdote alone. It is here significant, however, that O follows Livy more closely than the Periocha does in giving the reason for Flamininus's action—Philippo [Poeni scorto] suo desiderante gladiatorium spectaculum, and also in telling us that the victim was a Boian. Cf. Per. Gallum quendam. The others naturally make him one of those already condemned. Finally, judging from the few cases which we can control, we can hardly attribute to the author of O any literary talent whatsoever beyond that of the copyist; it is therefore highly probable that O reproduces its source pretty closely.

Although absolute certainty in this matter cannot be attained with the scanty material at hand, the comparison just made of these two notices in O with the accounts given elsewhere, as well as the evidence adduced, p. 246 n. 4, makes it very probable that the parent chronicle of O, Obsequens, and Cassiodorus was not the

source from which Florus, the author of *De Viris Ill.*, or St. Jerome drew. Seneca and Valerius Maximus might probably be excluded on chronological grounds, even if the differences shown did not exist. For the *Periochae* (and for Appian) the evidence is abundant.¹

Reinhold, *das Geschichtswerk des Livius als Quelle späterer Historiker*, Berlin, 1898, p. 13 comes to the conclusion that Eutropius, Festus, Obsequens, and Cassiodorus all drew from a chronicle which was itself derived from an epitome on which the *Periochae* and Orosius were based. It is impossible to discuss here the validity of his arguments; but this much may be said, that while Eutropius's work has in large measure the form of a chronicle, and although there are striking parallels between Eutropius and Cassiodorus which point to a close relationship between the two, it is fairly certain that the former used more than a single source in his history of the republic—the only part that concerns us here. Unfortunately O and Eutropius have little in common, but a comparison of O ll. 90–97 with Eutrop. 4, 10 and of O ll. 197–202 with Eutrop. 4, 16 certainly suggests that a re-examination of the evidence might not be unprofitable, for in neither case do the passages give evidence of near relationship.

Any attempt to assign a date for the composition of the parent chronicle of O, Obsequens, and Cassiodorus can be of little value. Scholars are still far from agreed as to the date of the *Periochae*. Grenfell and Hunt, p. 93, assign the compilation of O to the second or third century. Its source need not have been much earlier.²

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Sept. 12, 1904.

CLIFFORD HERSCHEL MOORE.

¹ Further proof may be obtained by comparing O ll. 89–97 on the beginning of the Third Punic War with *Per.* 52–53; *App. Pun.* 75 ff.; *Florus* 1, 31, 7 ff.; *Eutrop.* 4, 10; *Oros.* 4, 22, 1–7. O ll. 197–202 on the killing of Viriathus with *Vell. Pat.* 2, 1, 3; *Val. Max.* 9, 6, 4; *App. Iber.* 71; *Florus* 1, 33, 15–17; *Eutrop.* 4, 16; *De Viris Ill.* 71; *Oros.* 5, 4, 1; *Per.* 54; *Dio Cass. frg.* 80; etc.

² This article was in type before Kornemann's note in No. 37 of the *Berl. Phil. Wochenschrift* reached me, in which he announces that he has discovered the relationship of O, Obsequens, and Cassiodorus shown above, and promises to present soon the detailed proofs. That the same results have been obtained by two independent workers is a gratifying warrant of their validity.